U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Panther Habitat Assessment Methodology

Florida Panther

Generated January 04, 2023 03:39 PM UTC, IPaC v6.85.1-rc3



IPaC - Information for Planning and Consultation (https://ipac.ecosphere.fws.gov/): A project planning tool to help streamline the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service environmental review process.

Panther Habitat Assessment Methodology **September 24, 2012**

The Service developed the panther habitat assessment methodology in 2006 and updated the methodology in 2009. To evaluate project effects to the Florida panther, the Service considers the contributions the project lands provide to the Florida panther, recognizing not all habitats provide the same functional value. Kautz et al. (2006) also recognized not all habitats provide the same habitat value to the Florida panther and developed cost surface values for various habitat types, based on use by and presence in home ranges of panthers. The FWC (2006), using a similar concept, assigned likely use values of habitats to dispersing panthers. The FWC's habitats were assigned habitat suitability ranks between 0 and 10, with higher values indicating higher likely use by dispersing panthers.

The Service chose to evaluate project effects to the Florida panther through a similar process. We incorporated many of the same habitat types referenced in Kautz et al. (2006) and FWC (2006) with several adjustments to the assigned habitat use values reflecting consolidation of similar types of habitats and the inclusion of Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) water treatment and retention areas. We used these values (Tables PM1 and PM2) as the basis for habitat evaluations and the recommended compensation values to minimize project effects to the Florida panther, as discussed below.

Base ratio: To develop a base ratio that will provide for the protection of sufficient acreage of primary zone equivalent lands for a population of 90 panthers (31,923 acres per panther [Kautz et al. (2006)]) from the acreage of primary zone equivalent non-urban lands at risk, we developed the following approach.

The available primary zone equivalent lands at the time the methodology was developed (2006) were estimated at 3,276,563 acres (ac) (see Tables PM3 and PM4), with 2,073,865 ac of primary zone equivalent, non-urban lands preserved. The remaining non-urban, at-risk, private lands were estimated at 1,202,698 ac of primary zone equivalent lands. To meet the protected and managed lands threshold for a population of 90 panthers, an additional 799,205 ac of primary zone equivalent lands are needed. The base ratio is determined by dividing the primary equivalents of at-risk habitat to be secured (799,205 ac) by the result of the acres of at-risk habitat in the primary zone (610,935 ac) times the value of the primary zone (1); plus the at-risk acres in the dispersal zone (27,883 ac) times the value of the dispersal zone (1); plus the at-risk acres in the secondary zone (503,481 ac) times the value of the secondary zone (0.69); plus the at-risk acres in the other zone (655,996 ac) times the value of the other zone (0.33); minus the at-risk ac of habitat to be protected (799,205 ac). The results of this formula provide a base value of 1.98.

$$799{,}205 / ([(610{,}935 \times 1.0) + (27{,}883 \times 1) + (503{,}481 \times 0.69) + (655{,}996 \times 0.33)] - 799{,}205) = 1.98$$

In evaluating habitat losses in the consultation area, we used an estimate of 0.8 percent loss of habitat per year (Kautz, personal communication, 2004) to predict the amount of habitat loss anticipated in south Florida during the next 5 years (*i.e.,* 6,000 hectares/year [14,820 ac/ year]). We conservatively assume that we would be aware of half of the development projects that occur within the primary zone and the secondary zone combined. We further assume that 50 percent of these projects would be located in the primary zone and 50 percent would be located in the secondary zone. Based on these assumptions, we estimated that over a 5-year period about 37,000 ac (primary zone equivalent of 31,265 ac) would be developed without Federal review. To reflect this loss of habitat we adjusted the base acreage density of 31,923 acres per panther (Kautz et al. [2006]) to a new base density of 32,275 ac per panther, an increase of 352 acres (31,265/90=352+31,923=32,275). This adjustment results in a base ratio change from 1.98 to 2.23.

The Service realizes habitat losses from individual single-family residential developments will collectively compromise the Service's landscape scale effort to secure sufficient lands for a population of 90 panthers. We believe that, on an individual basis, single-family residential developments by individual lot owners on lots no larger than 5.0 ac will not result in take of panthers on a lot-by-lot basis; however, collectively these losses may affect the panther. Panthers are a wide-ranging species, and individually a 5.0-acre habitat change will not have a measurable impact. Compensation for such small-scale losses on a lot-by-lot basis is unlikely to result in meaningful conservation benefits for the panther versus the more holistic landscape level conservation strategy used in our habitat assessment methodology. To account for these losses, based on the 0.08 percent annual loss referenced by Kautz (2004), we estimated the development of vacant lands (2003) in northern Golden Gate Estates and Lehigh Acres in Collier and Lee counties, respectively, at about 2,590 ac per year per development, or about 12,950 ac per development over a 5-year period. As above, to reflect this loss we adjusted the revised base acreage density to 32,563 ac, an increase of 288 acres (25,900/90=288+352+31,923=32,563). To account for this loss, we further adjusted the base value from 2.23 to 2.48.

There is also a need for road crossings in strategic locations and we believe there are projects that may not have habitat loss factors but will have traffic generation factors. The Service considers increases in traffic as an indirect effect from a project, which can contribute to panther mortality. For assessment purposes, since our habitat methodology does not provide a mechanism to address this type of effect directly, we are providing a habitat surrogate of 500 ac per year of habitat loss for these types of projects, with a not to exceed value of 2,500 ac over the 5-year period. The 500 ac per year is based on average cost of FDOT bridge/box culvert crossings (3.6 to 5 million dollars) converted to acreage equivalent costs (8,500/ac). This 2,500 acre habitat surrogate adds an additional 28 acres per panther to the above adjusted base for a new base of 32,951 ac per panther (2,500/90=28+288+352+31,923=32,591). Therefore, we have added another 0.02 to the base ratio to address traffic impacts, which could provide an incentive to implement crossings in key locations. Following the same approach shown above, we adjusted the base ratio from 2.48 to 2.5. The Service intends to re-evaluate this base ratio periodically and adjust as needed to make sure all adverse effects are adequately ameliorated and offset as required under section 7 of the act and to achieve the Service's landscape scale effort for the Florida panther.

The Service uses a very conservative density of panthers per area of habitat to calculate the compensation ratio for impacts south of the Caloosahatchee River. Specifically, the Service relied on the low estimate in the range presented in Kautz et al. (2006) to reach its factor of 2.5. This low estimate density value was calculated by dividing the documented number of panthers in 2000, or 62 panthers, by an estimate of the habitat in the primary zone that was most consistently occupied by panthers from 1981 to 2000. As previously mentioned, it is clear the panther population south of the river has increased notably since 2000, in 2001 = 78 panthers; in 2002 = 80; in 2003 = 87; in 2004 = 78; in 2005 = 82; in 2006 = 97; in 2007 = 117; and 2008=104. In 2007 more panthers were documented in south Florida than have been documented since current verified estimates have been collected. Furthermore, none of the panthers recorded south of the Caloosahatchee River lives exclusively outside of the primary zone, although some do venture outside of it on occasion (McBride, personal communication, 2007).

The average population size south of the Caloosahatchee River over the past 7 years is 86. If we were to use this number instead of 62 to calculate the compensation ratio and to use the entire acreage of the primary zone as the denominator, the revised compensation ratio requirement would be 0.32 ac protected for every acre developed. Furthermore, if we excluded the “other zone” altogether from the analysis, the ratio would be 1.01, still lower than the Service’s current ratio. We believe this conservative approach is warranted because of the inherent importance of habitat protection to panther conservation.

<u>Landscape multiplier</u>: As stated in the above section on primary zone equivalent lands, the location of a project in the landscape of the core area of the Florida panther is important. As we have previously discussed, lands in the primary and dispersal zones are of the highest importance in a landscape context to the Florida panther, with lands in the secondary zone of less importance, and lands in the other zone of lower importance. These zones affect the level of compensation the Service believes is necessary to minimize a project’s effects to Florida panther habitat. Table PM5 provides the landscape compensation multipliers for various compensation scenarios. As an example, if a project is in the other zone and compensation is proposed in the primary zone, a primary zone equivalent multiplier of 0.33 is applied to the PHUs (see discussion below) developed for the project. If the project is in the secondary zone and compensation is in the primary zone, then a primary zone equivalent multiplier of 0.69 is applied to the PHUs developed for the project.

<u>Panther Habitat Units – habitat functional value</u>: Prior to applying the base ratio and landscape multipliers discussed above, we evaluate the project site and assign functional values to the habitats present. This is done by assigning each habitat type on-site a habitat suitability value from the habitats shown in Tables PM1 and PM2. The habitat suitability value for each habitat type is then multiplied by the acreage of that habitat type resulting in a number representing PHUs. These PHUs are summed for a site total, which is used as a measurement of the functional value the habitat provides to the Florida panthers. This process is also followed for the compensation sites.

As of January 2005, the Service has been using a panther habitat suitability ranking system based in part on methods in publications by Swanson et al. (2005) and Kautz et al. (2006) and adjusted by the Service to consolidate similar types of habitats and to include CERP water treatment and retention areas located in the panther’s range (Table PM1). Since the implementation of this ranking system, the Service has received two additional, published habitat assessment studies (Cox et al. [2006] and Land et al. [2008]) that further assess habitat usage by the Florida panther. As it is the Service’s policy to incorporate the most current peer-reviewed science into our assessment and review of project effects on the Florida panther, we have revised the current habitat suitability ranking system.

To revise these values, the Service, in coordination with FWC, examined the habitat ranking values in the two new papers referenced above and Kautz et al. (2006) publication and developed a spreadsheet. The spreadsheet was developed to: (1) compare the results of each of these published analyses; and (2) provide a habitat ranking system for each of the assessments. On the first page of the spreadsheet, labeled "panther habitat selection analysis - habitat papers comparison," we summarized the types of analyses performed as to whether it was second order (selection of a home range with a large study area) or third order (selection of habitats within a home range). For each of these analyses, we then listed the habitat types reported in each paper and their order of selection by panthers (Table PM6). We used the cost surface scores and the rank differences from the Kautz et al. (2006) analyses as the selection order and for a measure of statistical differences among the habitat types. Selected habitat types are represented as bold black numbers and avoided habitats are bold red numbers. Habitats that were neither selected nor avoided are shown as normal font black numbers. Ranks with the same letter are not different from each other. Results from the Cox et al. (2006) and Land et al. (2008) papers using Euclidean analyses are shown in a similar fashion.

On the second page of the spreadsheet, labeled "summary of ranking values," we ranked the habitat types on a scale from 0 to 10 according the results from each study and professional judgment (Table PM7). We used our original ranking for the Kautz et al. analyses (with the ranking scale reversed such that the best habitat received a "10" and the lowest quality habitat was "0").

We developed similar rankings for the habitat analyses reported in Cox et al. (2006) and Land et al. (2008). Selected habitats fell in the range of 7 to 10; habitats that were used in proportion to availability were ranked from 4 to 6; and habitats that were avoided by panthers were ranked from 0 to 3. Ranks for habitats within each of the 3 outcomes began at the top of each of the ranges (selected = 10, used in proportion to availability = 6, avoided = 3). Some shifting of the ranks occurred based on the letter-coded statistical ranking. For instance, under *Land GPS Euclidean third order* both upland and wetland forests were selected by panthers and were not statistically different from each other (note the ranking of a and ab for upland and wetland forest, respectively). However, wetland forest and dry prairie also were not significantly different from each other. To show these relationships, we ranked upland forest as a 10, wetland forest as a 9, and we increased dry prairie from a 6 (top of the neither selected nor avoided ranking) to a 7 to reflect the interplay between dry prairie and wetland forest based on professional judgment.

To generate a new ranking of panther habitats for use as a habitat assessment measure, we simply averaged the ranks of the six different analyses presented in the spreadsheet to the first decimal place. Half of these results were second order habitat analyses (Kautz et al. compositional, Kautz et al. Euclidean and Cox et al. Euclidean) and the other half were third order analyses (Cox et al. Euclidean; Land et al. VHF Euclidean; Land et al. GPS Euclidean).

In our assessment, we noted several outlier habitat rankings that, based on our understanding of habitat needs of the Florida panther and our concern for human/panther interactions, appear to provide conflicting values. These habitats and their associated rankings are: (1) barren/disturbed – 5.2; (2) urban – 5.0; (3) open water – 3.3; and (4) coastal wetlands – 1.0. We believe adjustments are warranted for these four categories and our adjusted values are based on the following:

<u>Barren/disturbed</u>: Barren/disturbed lands may include many temporary changes to land use, such as crop rotation and prescribed fires that likely have little impact on the value to panthers. Areas disturbed by human impact on a longer-term basis (*e.g.*, parking of equipment and material storage areas) have chronic effects on panthers that we judge decrease the value of these lands for panthers. Barren/disturbed lands include disturbed lands (Florida land use and cover classification system [FLUCCS] 740) and spoil areas (FLUCCS 733). Based on the above reasons, we assigned barren/disturbed land a value of 3.

<u>Urban</u>: Panther habitat models typically include urban in the “other” category that was neither avoided nor selected by panthers. Highly urbanized areas are not found in the panther core area that was used in assessing habitat use, as panthers have already selected against these land use types by reducing their range. However, urbanizing areas in more rural settings may appear in the assessment of habitat use. Nevertheless, we believe that potential human/panther interactions are important conflict factors to consider as well. Therefore, we assigned both developed rural and highly urbanized areas a value of 0.

<u>Open water</u>: Open water has been found to be either avoided by panthers or included in the “other” category that was neither avoided nor selected by panthers. We believe open water in any setting provides little to no value to panthers. However, open water edges and berms can be a valuable foraging area or dispersal pathway in more rural settings, although these edges in an urbanized setting could promote human/panther conflicts. Therefore, we assigned open water in an urban setting, with or without emergent vegetation, and surrounding berms a value of 0. However, in rural settings, the littoral edges and berms may provide species benefit and are further addressed under the reservoir discussion below.

<u>Coastal wetlands</u>: There are few strictly coastal wetlands, such as salt marshes and mangrove swamps, within the panther focus area. Where these occur, they are closely interspersed with other upland habitats. In this context, we believe that these areas are of greater value to the panther than the models indicate. These areas may, for the most part, be avoided by panthers; but, they can be of value in the proper landscape context to higher value habitats. Therefore we assigned these areas a value of 3.

We also note that three additional land uses and or habitat types referenced in our original habitat rankings were not components addressed directly in the model. These include: (1) exotic/nuisance plants; (2) stormwater treatment areas (STAs); and (3) reservoirs. We believe these categories are important in our assessment of panther habitat values and warrant consideration in our habitat ranking system.

Exotic/nuisance plants: Although exotic plants can be suitable for providing denning cover and habitat connectivity between other land types for panthers and panther prey, they generally do not provide the preferred foraging base of plants consumed by deer and other herbivores (Fleming et al. 1994). We believe prey foraging value, or lack thereof, is an important constraint in our habitat assessments. Therefore, we assigned these habitats a value of 3. Likewise, some native plant species can become so dominant and dense, especially under altered hydrologic and fire suppression regimes, that they no longer provide high habitat value for the panther even though occasional use may occur. The most common example is dense, nearly monotypic cattail stands, which are of reduced value relative to less altered marsh communities. Another example of this type of nuisance species dominance is dense stands of cabbage palm dominated communities. For systems represented by this habitat profile, we also assigned a value of 3.

STAs (Everglades restoration): STAs are generally designed to provide a water quality treatment function for nutrient removal from received upstream discharges and may include multiple berms and adjacent littoral shelves. Depending on the design and mode of operation, they can become vegetated by dense monotypic stands of cattails or can incorporate a diverse mosaic of wetland communities and hydroperiods that support sawgrass and shrub/scrub species. Therefore, they can provide various levels of resource benefit to panthers and panther prey species as discussed below. For this reason, the final value of an STA is determined in a case-by-case basis during project review.

The Service participates in planning efforts that encourage location of STAs at sites with minimal areas of natural habitat, with a preference for sites that are currently in agriculture. Because these facilities by design are located in areas that currently provide a reduced value to panthers and panther prey species, the Service values these systems pre and post project development as a neutral effect on panthers. In these situations, the development of an STA from existing agriculture land uses would be evaluated as if the agriculture land use was present following project development, with no increase or decrease in habitat value to the panther.

However, this neutral effect assessment is only applicable to land conversions from nonnative habitats to STAs. For those projects that remove natural habitats, the Service considers STA functional values to mimic the value of the natural system the STA is designed to achieve. As an example, an STA design that results in a dense monotypic stand of cattails would be appropriately evaluated following the exotic/nuisance species profile. Similarly, a system designed to provide a diverse mosaic of wetland communities and hydroperiods would be evaluated following the wet prairie/marsh profile. Another system design that incorporates internal and external berms could include an edge benefit evaluation identifying the berms and adjacent littoral shelves and their benefit to the Florida panther and panther prey species, and follow the values provided for improved pasture for the berms and or wet prairie/marsh values for the littoral shelves. An individual project assessment of pre and post habitat impacts will identify whether the project as designed results in loss of functional value or provides benefit to the Florida panther and panther prey species.

Reservoirs (Everglades restoration, large water storage area, mines): Reservoirs were originally classified as their own category in our 2003 assessment method. They differ from open-water systems primarily with their location in the landscape. In urban areas, reservoirs have always been considered open water and given a value of 0. In rural areas, the open water portion of the reservoir provides no habitat value, although the edges and the berms can provide valuable foraging area or dispersal pathways for the panther and panther prey species. Therefore, the 2003 methodology assigned a value of 1.5 to reservoirs to attempt to account for these benefits.

After further consideration, we believe a more appropriate way to evaluate the value of reservoirs is to evaluate the open water component separately from the reservoir edges and berms. Therefore, we are no longer assigning a value to reservoirs as their own habitat classification. When large-scale reservoir projects are proposed in the rural landscape, all open water areas should be classified as such (value = 0). Berms and edges should be classified as the habitat they will most resemble in the post-project condition. For example: a 1,000-acre reservoir with 50 ac of grassed berms and 50 ac of berms with roads along the top would be evaluated as 900 ac of open water, 50 ac of pasture, and 50 ac of urban.

We also recognized the habitat matrix (Table PM7) lists four native habitats similar in functional habitat value to panthers as non-native habitats: marsh/wet prairie – 4.7; xeric scrub – 4.5; shrub and brush – 5.5; and dry prairie – 6.3. These habitat ratings, which are between 4 and 6, are classified as being neither selected nor avoided by panthers. The Service's Florida Panther Recovery Plan's (Service 2008) action 1.1.1.2.3 recommends habitat preservation and restoration within the primary zone be provided in situations where land use intensification cannot be avoided. We view this recommendation as a key parameter in our conservation goal to locate, preserve, and restore lands containing sufficient area and appropriate land cover types to ensure the long-term survival of a population of Florida panthers south of the Caloosahatchee River.

Therefore, for assessment purposes, if a project is proposing restoration of non-native habitats (*e.g.*, pasture, row crops, groves, etc.) to native habitats, we believe that a restoration lift to a value of 7 is appropriate. The functional value of 7 corresponds to that value found in the literature where panthers begin to select for that habitat attribute (Table PM7). We also believe a full functional lift credit for these restorations is appropriate as the time lag from restoration to full functional value is estimated to be relatively short (less than 5 years) for non-forested systems. However, the calculation of forested restoration values remains the same as in the previous methodology, which is one-half the difference between pre- and post-restoration.

In summary, we believe appropriate adjustments to our original PHU values are warranted based on the most current peer-reviewed science and our category specific discussions above. Therefore, we have incorporated the above referenced values into our revised habitat assessment matrix and these values are the current basis for habitat evaluations and the recommended compensation values to minimize project effects to the Florida panther (Table PM2).

Exotic species assessment: since many habitat types in south Florida are infested with exotic plant species, which affects the functional value a habitat type provides to foraging wildlife species (*i.e.*, primarily deer and hog), we believe the presence of these species and the value these species provide to foraging wildlife needs to be considered in the habitat assessment methodology. As shown in Table PM2, we have a habitat type and functional value shown for exotic species. This category includes not only the total acres of pure exotic species habitats present but also the percent-value acreages of the exotic species present in other habitat types.

For example, a site with 100 ac of pine flatwoods with 10 percent exotics would be treated in our habitat assessment methodology as 90 ac of pine flatwoods and 10 ac of exotics. Adding another 100 ac of cypress swamp with 10 percent exotics would change our site from 90 ac of pine flatwoods and 10 ac of exotics to 90 ac of pine flatwoods, 90 ac of cypress swamp, and 20 ac of exotics.

Habitat assessment methodology application – example: To illustrate the use of our habitat assessment methodology, we provide the following example. A 100-acre project site is proposed for a residential development. Plans call for the entire site to be cleared. The project site contains 90 ac of hydric pine flatwoods and 10 ac of exotic vegetation, and is located in the "secondary zone." The applicant has offered habitat compensation in the "primary zone" to minimize the impacts of the project to the Florida panther. To calculate the PHUs provided by the site, we multiply the habitat acreage by the "habitat suitability value" for each habitat type and add those values to obtain a value of 885 PHUs ((90 ac of pine flatwoods x 9.5 [the habitat suitability value for pine flatwoods] = 855 PHUs) + (10 ac of exotic vegetation x 3 [the habitat suitability value for exotics] = 30 PHUs) = 885 PHUs). The value of 885 PHUs is then multiplied by the 2.5 (the base ratio) and 0.69 (the landscape multiplier) resulting in a value of 1,527 PHUs for the project site. In this example, the acquisition of lands in the primary zone containing at least 1,527 PHUs is recommended to compensate for the loss of habitat to the Florida panther resulting from this project.

LITERATURE CITED

Cox, J.J., D.S. Maehr, and J.L. Larkin. 2006. Florida panther habitat use: New approach to an old problem. Journal of Wildlife Management 70:1778-1785.

Fleming, D.M., J. Schortemeyer, and J. Ault. 1994. Distribution, abundance, and demography of white-tailed deer in the Everglades. National Park Service, Everglades National Park, Homestead, Florida.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). 2006. Use of least cost pathways to identify key highway segments for panther conservation. Tallahassee, FL.

Kautz, R. 2004. Personal communication. Panther Biologist. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Naples, Florida.

Kautz, R., R. Kawula, T. Hoctor, J. Comiskey, D. Jansen, D. Jennings, J. Kasbohm, F. Mazzotti, R. McBride, L. Richardson, and K. Root. 2006. How much is enough? Landscape-scale conservation for the Florida panther. Biological Conservation.

Land, E.D., D.B. Shindle, R.J. Kawula, J.F. Benson, M.A. Lotz, and D.P. Onorato. 2008. Florida panther habitat selection analysis of Concurrent GPS and VHF telemetry data. Journal of Wildlife Management 72:633-639.

McBride, R. T. 2007. Personal communication. Professional Tracker-Houndsman. Rancher's Supply Inc., P.O. Box 725, Alpine, Texas 79831

Swanson, K., D. Land, R. Kautz and R. Kawula. 2005. Use of least cost pathways to identify key highway segments for Florida panther conservation. Pages 191-200 in R.A. Beausoleil and D.A. Martorello, editors. Proceedings of the Eighth Mountain Lion Workshop, Olympia, Washington, USA.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2008. Florida Panther Recovery Plan (*Puma concolor coryi*), Third Revision. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Atlanta, Georgia. 217pp.

Table PM1. Original panther habitat unit values for use in assessing habitat value to the Florida panther.

Land Cover Type	Value	Land Cover Type	Value	Land Cover Type	Value
Water	0	STA	4.5	Cypress swamp	9
Urban	0	Shrub swamp	5	Sand pine scrub	9
Coastal strand	1	Shrub and brush	5	Sandhill	9
Reservoir	1.5	Dry prairie	6	Hardwood-Pine forest	9
Mangrove swamp	2	Grassland/pasture	7	Pine forest	9
Salt marsh	2	Freshwater marsh	9	Xeric oak scrub	10
Exotic/nuisance plants	3	Bottomland hardwood	9	Hardwood forest	10
Cropland	4	Bay swamp	9		
Orchards/groves	4	Hardwood swamp	9		

Table PM2. Revised panther habitat unit values for use in assessing habitat value to the Florida panther.

Land Cover Type	Value	Land Cover Type	Value	Land Cover Type	Value
Reservoirs	*	Xeric scrub	4.5	Dry prairie	6.3
STAs	**	Orchards/groves	4.7	Upland Hardwood Forest	9.0
Urban	0	Marsh/ wet prairie	4.7	Cypress swamp	9.2
Water	0	Cropland	4.8	Hardwood swamp	9.2
Barren/Disturbed lands	3	Improved pasture	5.2	Hardwood-Pine	9.3
Coastal wetlands	3	Shrub swamp/brush	5.5	Upland-Hydric Pine forest	9.5
Exotic/nuisance plants	3	Unimproved pasture	5.7		

* PHU values for reservoirs are evaluated based on open water for the main water areas and the appropriate categories for berms and other non-water sections. Refer to pages 5- 7 for the accompanying text for guiding criteria for these systems.
** PHU values for stormwater treatment areas vary depending on design criteria, mode of operation, location in native or non-native habitats, and other landscape features. Refer to page 6 for the accompanying text for guiding criteria for these systems.

Table PM3. Land Held for Conservation within the Florida Panther Core Area.

	Acres	Primary Equivalent Factor	Primary Equivalent Acres
Primary	1,659,657	1.00	1,659,657
Dispersal	0	1.00	0
Secondary	308,623	0.69	212,950
Other	609,872	0.33	201,258
TOTAL	2,578,152	TOTAL	2,073,865

Table PM4. Undeveloped Privately Owned Land within Florida Panther Core Area.

	Acres	Primary Equivalent Factor	Primary Equivalent Acres
Primary	610,935	1.00	610,935
Dispersal	27,883	1.00	27,883
Secondary	503,481	0.69	347,402
Other	655,996*	0.33	216,479
TOTAL	1,962,294	TOTAL	1,202,699

* About 819,995 ac are at-risk in the other zone with about 80 percent with resource value. Total ac of at-risk privately owned lands are 1,962,294 ac.

Table PM5. Landscape Compensation Multipliers.

Zone of Impacted Lands	Zone of Compensation Lands	Multiplier
Primary	Secondary	1.45
Secondary	Primary	0.69
Other	Secondary	0.48
Other	Primary	0.33

Table PM6. Panther Habitat Selection Analyses – Habitat Papers Comparison.

Habitats	Kautz compositional second order	rank	Kautz Euclidean second order	rank
Hardwood swamp	**1**	A	**3**	A
Pineland	**2**	A	**2**	AB
Cypress swamp	3	AB	**1**	BC
Upland forest	**1**	B	**4**	CD
Dry prairie	5	B	5	DE
Shrub and brush	4	C	7	EF
Xeric scrub	3	CD	**9**	F
Marsh	5	CD	**9**	F
Unimproved pasture	**7**	DE	7	G
Barren	6	E	**9**	G
Improved pasture	**9**	EF	6	G
Urban	8	F	8	G
Cropland	**9**	F	8	H
Citrus	**10**	G	8	H
Coastal wetlands	**11**	G	8	H
Open water	**10**	H	**10**	I
Exotic plants				
STA				
Reservoir				

Habitats	Cox Euclidean second order	rank	Cox Euclidean third order	rank
Coniferous forest	**1**	A	**1**	A
pineland				
Hardwood forest	**3**	C	**2**	A
hardwood hammock				
mixed pine/hardwood				
palm/oak				
tropical hammock				
Forested wetland	**2**	B	**3**	A
cypress swamp				
mixed forest				
shrub swamp				
hardwood swamp				
other wet forest				
Dry prairie/grass	**4**	C	4	B
dry prairie				
grassland				
Open wetland	7	E	**7**	C
marsh and wet prairie				
sawgrass				
cattail				
Agricultural	**5**	D	5	B
improved pasture				
citrus				
row crop				
other agriculture				
Urban/barren	**6**	E	6	B
bare soil				
high-impact urban				
low-impact urban				
extractive				

Habitats	Land VHF Euclidean third order	rank	Land GPS Euclidean third order	rank
Upland forest	**1**	A	**1**	A
pine/hardwood				
hardwood hammock				
pinelands				
tropical hammock				
palm/hardwood				
Wetland forest	**2**	A	**2**	AB
cypress swamp				
cypress/pine/palm				
mixed swamp				
hardwood swamp				
Dry prairie/grass	3	B	3	BC
grassland				
unimproved pasture				
improved pasture				
Marsh/shrub	6	B	4	C
marsh/wet prairie				
sawgrass				
cattail				
shrub swamp				
Other	4	B	5	C
open water				
shrub/brush				
barren				
high impact urban				
low impact urban				
extractive				
Agriculture	5	B	6	C
citrus				
row crop				
other agriculture				

second order - selection of home range with entire study area
third order - selection of habitats within home range
Bold (black) - habitat used more than availability (selection)
Bold (red) - habitat used less than availability (avoidance)
rank - habitats with same letters did not differ in preference

Table PM7. Summary of Ranking Values

Habitats	Kautz compositional second order	Kautz Euclidean second order	Cox Euclidean second order	Cox Euclidean third order	Land VHF Euclidean third order	Land GPS Euclidean third order	Average
Hardwood swamp	10	7	9	10	10	9	9.2
Pineland	9	8	10	10	10	10	9.5
Cypress swamp	8	9	9	10	10	9	9.2
Upland forest	10	6	8	10	10	10	9.0
Dry prairie	6	5	8	6	6	7	6.3
Shrub and brush	7	3	no data	no data	6	6	5.5
Xeric scrub	8	1	no data	no data	no data	no data	4.5
Marsh	6	1	6	3	6	6	4.7
Unimproved pasture	4	3	8	6	6	7	5.7
Barren	5	1	7	6	6	6	5.2
Improved pasture	2	4	7	6	6	6	5.2
Urban	3	2	7	6	6	6	5.0
Cropland	2	2	7	6	6	6	4.8
Citrus	1	2	7	6	6	6	4.7
Coastal wetlands	0	2	no data	no data	no data	no data	1.0
Open water	1	0	no data	no data	6	6	3.3
Exotic plants							
STA							
Reservoir							

habitat selection	7,8,9,10
neither selected nor avoided	4,5,6
habitat avoidance	0,1,2,3